



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,761	11/19/2001	Kenneth Y. Ogami	CYPR-CD01179M	2006

7590 04/18/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

DO, THUAN V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2825

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>Opn</i>
	09/989,761	OGAMI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thuan Do	2825		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2003 .

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is responsive to the preliminary amendment entered on 02/06/2003. Claims 1-28 are pending in this office action.

Claim objection

Claim 1, the terms "a subsequent design project " is unclear to what applicant intend to mean. Correction is required.

Drawings

Applicant filed new drawing dated 01/28/02, unfortunately, it is not in the file document. A new drawing copy should be provide in the next response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Heile et al., Pat. No. 6,321,369.

Regarding claim 1: Heile teaches a method comprising:

- a. defining a plurality of global resource parameters for a first design project (col. 14, lines 23-42 where Heile teaches "...designer can then select between various designs (e.g., files), parameters... ") ;
- b. storing the plurality of global resource parameters as a default global setting (col. 14, lines 23-42); and
- c. utilizing the stored default global setting as the plurality of global resource parameters on a subsequent design project (col. 7, lines 40-45 where Heile teaches the sub-designs are preferably automatically updated).

Regarding claims 2-4: These claims teach the well known method similar to the method of claim 1 and rejected in the similar manner.

Regarding claim 5: Heile teaches a method with chosen parameter value (col. 14, lines 23-42).

Regarding claim 6: Heile teaches a method with propagating the chosen parameter value (col. 14, lines 23-42).

Regarding claim 7: Heile teaches a method comprising:

- a. selecting the global resource parameter via an input device wherein the global resource parameter is associated with a first design project (col. 14, lines 23-42);
- b. displaying a plurality of possible parameter values for the global resource in response to selecting the global resource parameter (col. 14, lines 23-42);
- c. choosing one of the plurality of possible parameter values as a chosen parameter value via the input device (col. 14, lines 23-42); and
- d. storing the chosen parameter value as a default global setting for use by a second design project (col. 14, lines 23-42 for chosen parameter value and col. 7, lines 40-45 for second design project).

Regarding claims 8-11: These claims teach the well known method similar to the method of claim 7 and rejected in the similar manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 103 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 12-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heile et al., Pat. No. 6,321,369 in view of Goykhman, Pub. No. 2002/0174134

Regarding claim 12: Heile teaches a system similar to the method of claim 1 and rejected in the similar rationale.

However, Heile does not teach tracking a location. Goykhman teaches this feature as tracking a user's activities in page 1, paragraph 0009.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the integrated circuit design art at the time of the invention to have combined the teaching of Goykhman into Heile to

include tracking a location because it would help engineer in design software using tracking a location for quick manipulate database.

Regarding claim 13: Heile teaches a system with the global resource menu (col. 8, lines 59-67).

Regarding claims 14-16: These claims teach the well known method similar to the method of claim 12 and rejected in the similar manner.

Regarding claims 17 and 23: Heile teaches a system similar to the method of claim 1 and rejected in the similar rationale.

However, Heile does not teach tabular form. Goykhman teaches this feature as activity table in page 2, paragraph 0029 .

The motivation is similar to the claim 12 one.

Regarding claims 18-22 and 24-28: These claims teach the well known method similar to the claims 17 and 23 respectively and rejected in the similar manner.

CONTACT INFORMATION

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan Do whose telephone number is 703-305-2362. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30 (except 2nd Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Smith can be reached on 703-308-1323. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0596.



Thuan Do
Patent examiner
4/15/03